REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough consideration given the subject application. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Figures 1-6 in view of Nakahara et al. (US Pat. No. 5,982,470); and rejected claims 1-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Figures 1-6 in view of Hayakawa et al. (US Pat. No. 6,172,732). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including a gate electrode, a gate pad and gate links on a substrate, the gate links having gate dummy patterns.

Claim 9 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 9 recites a combination of elements including forming a gate electrode, a gate pad and gate links on a substrate, the gate links having gate dummy patterns.

Claim 17 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 17 recites a combination of elements including forming a gate electrode, a gate pad and gate links on a substrate, the gate links having gate dummy patterns.

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the invention.

The Examiner admits that Applicants' Figures 1-6 do not disclose gate dummy patterns. The Examiner cites Nakahara et al. and Hayakawa et al. in an attempt to cure the deficiencies of Applicants' Figures 1-6.

Nakahara et al. teaches connection terminals 18 placed at high density so as to correspond to TAB (Tape Automated Bonding), etc., on the side of the external circuit. The

sinuous electrode sinuates from the scanning electrode towards the connection terminal 18. Column 8, lines 5-23. An electrode having the same thickness as the sinuous electrode 19 is formed as a dummy electrode in order to achieve a uniform thickness of the seal 5. Column 8, lines 32-41. Between dummy electrodes 47 are formed along a space between the sinuous electrodes 23 formed on the substrate 1. Column 33, lines 4-9. Nakahara et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Applicants' Figures 1-6.

Like Nakahara et al., Hayakawa et al. teaches disposed on one electrode substrate which includes one insulating substrate made of transparent glass which constitutes part of the liquid crystal display device, are display electrodes 46-1 to 46-10 which are made of transparent conductive film and wired in parallel to constitute pixels, terminal electrodes (connection electrodes, i.e., input electrodes) 41-1 to 41-10 connected to the electrodes (output outer lead) of the TCP...Column 6, lines 8-18. Dummy electrodes 43 provided in the spaces between the terminal electrodes 41-n within the area of the sealing material 44 of the liquid crystal display device and within the so-called frame portion which is a non-lighting portion outside the display portion (the lighting portion) in which the electrodes of the upper and lower electrode substrates intersect. Column 9, lines 19-36. Hayakawa et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Applicants' Figures 1-6.

Nakahara et al. and Hayakawa et al. may teach dummy electrodes, but the references fail to teach explicitly or implicitly, gate links having gate dummy patterns as in claims 1, 9, and 17. Nakahara et al. and Hayakawa et al. do not teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983); see also *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976). The invention of this application comprises a method of irradiating

a film by scanning it more than once so that a portion of the beams overlap in the energy slope regions.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 9, and 17, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7371. If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 22, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Teresa M. Arroyo
Registration No.: 50,015
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile: (202) 496-7756
Attorneys for Applicant